



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/801,340	03/07/2001	Don M. Simpson	STL920000077US1	4769

7590 10/06/2003
Brian C. Kunzler
Suite 425
10 West 100 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84101

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CAM LINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/801,340

Applicant(s)

SIMPSON ET AL.

Examiner

Cam-Linh T. Nguyen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 – 3, 6 – 11, 13 – 15, 18 – 22, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barr et al (U.S. 5,742,816).

♦ As per claim 1, 13,

Barr et al discloses a method of identifying textual documents corresponding to search topics, where the textual document can be a text, image, audio, or other information (Col. 9 line 15 – 18, Barr) comprising:

- "Receiving an incoming stream of text comprised of words" See Fig. 6B, element 142a, col. 23 line 21 – 24 of Barr. The "string" in Barr includes sentence, which is comprised of words (Col. 9 line 33 – 38), therefore, this "string" is considered same as "stream".
- "Consulting a semantic network to automatically identifying one or more word patterns" See Fig. 6B, element 142d, col. 23 line 46 – 55.
- "Referencing a known object identified by word pattern of the semantic network" See Fig. 6B element 142l.

♦ As per claim 2, 14, Barr discloses:

- “Loading the semantic network substantially entirely into RAM memory of a processor”

The “Document index database 117” in Fig. 3 contains a list of search terms (Col. 10 line 8 –16), therefore, this list corresponds to the “semantic network”. In Fig. 3, the “Document index database” is loaded into the query server, which is a computer consists of processors, memory, and system disks (Col. 10 line 46 – 50), therefore, the “semantic network” may “substantially entirely loading into RAM memory of a processor”.

Since the semantic network is loaded within the RAM memory, it must consulting the semantic network within the RAM when consulting the semantic network is conducted.

◆ As per claim 3, 6 – 8, 15, 18 – 20, Barr discloses:

- “Dividing the stream of text into a plurality of threads and conducting the step of consulting ... word patterns”. Because the system parses the query into proper noun, slow words, and consulting the semantic network, therefore, it clearly divides the text query into plurality of threads. All together, it searches the database fro matching document.

◆ As per claim 9 – 11, 21 – 22, Barr discloses:

- “Presenting the identified known objects to a user” See Fig. 6B, element 142I of Barr.
- “Providing links between identified word patterns” Se Fig. 4, element 340 – 360, Fig. 4A – C, of Barr.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4 – 5, 12, 16 - 17, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barr et al (U.S. 5,742,816) in view of Martin John Trotter (U.S. 5,870,751).

♦ As per claim 4, 12, 16, Barr discloses all of the claimed subject matter except hierarchical recognition of words.

Claims 4, 12, and 16 include all of the limitations of claims 1 and 13, and include a semantic network of recognized words and patterns of words in a hierarchical order. Barr does not disclose this limitation. However, Trotter, on the other hand, discloses a semantic network that recognized words in a hierarchical order (See Fig. 1, col. 1 line 19 – 23, 60 – 66, Trotter). It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Trotter into the system of Barr because the it shows the relationship of words between databases or nodes.

♦ As per claim 5, 17, the combination of Barr and Trotter discloses:

- "Examining words in the stream of text in a sequential order as the words are received" See Fig. 2, col. 5 line 45 – 48, col. 11 line 10 - 14, Trotter.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2171

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Kanevsky et al (U.S. 6,104,989) discloses a real time detection of topical changes and topic identification via likelihood based methods.
- Messerly et al (U.S. 6,076,051) discloses an information retrieval utilizing semantic representation of text.
- Dahlgren et al (U.S. 5,794,050) discloses a natural language understanding system.
- Luciw et al (U.S. 5,621,903) discloses a method and apparatus for deducing user intent and providing computer implemented services.
- Oyanagi et al (U.S. 4,815,005) discloses a semantic network machine for artificial intelligence computer.
- Nelson et al (U.S. 6,243,713) discloses multimedia document retrieval by application of multimedia queries to a unified index of multimedia data for a plurality of multimedia data types.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam-Linh T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305- 1951. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308- 1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703- 746- 7239.

Art Unit: 2171

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703- 305-3900.

Cam-Linh Nguyen
Art Unit 2171

LN


SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100